

A bill (S. 2467) to enhance and improve the trade relations of the United States by strengthening United States trade enforcement efforts and encouraging United States trading partners to adhere to the rules and norms of international trade, and for other purposes.

Mr. SESSIONS. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination on today's calendar, Calendar No. 566. I further ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Randall L. Tobias, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 295

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order with respect to S. 295, the China currency bill, be modified to reflect a date no later than September 29, 2006, or the last day of the second session of the 109th Congress, whichever is earliest, and that all other provisos remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 2006

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 30. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for up to 1 hour with the first 30 minutes under

the control of the Democratic leader or his designee and the final 30 minutes under the control of the majority leader or his designee; further, that following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 2454, the border control bill, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. SESSIONS. Today, by an overwhelming vote, we passed the lobbying bill. We now have turned to another important piece of legislation, the border control bill. We will be working on this bill for the remainder of the week and into next week. Under an agreement we entered this afternoon, tomorrow we will have more debate on the bill and Senator SPECTER will offer his substitute amendment at noon. Votes are expected tomorrow, and we will alert everyone when a vote is locked in for a certain time.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. On behalf of the majority leader, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator DURBIN for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Alabama for coming to the floor and addressing one of the most important bills we will consider this year, the question of the immigration system in America. My colleague and I may disagree—and we do disagree—on the substance of this bill, but I thank him for engaging the Senate in this conversation and dialogue. It is important that the American people know what we are about, and they should also know that we are taking our time to do it right.

I am a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee with the Senator from Alabama. We spent a lot of time on this bill, as we should have. It is a big challenge. I am not sure it is perfect. I think we can make it a better bill. But I am certainly pleased that the bill we brought to the floor is a balanced approach.

The one thing I like about it is it starts in the same place as many of its detractors want us to start, and that is to make sure that we have enforcement in this country. There should be laws; they should be enforced. That means we should do more, put more resources and more effort into making certain that our borders are not porous. It is a challenge. During the course of any given year, I am told that 300 million people pass between the United States

and Mexico. The vast majority of them are doing it legally. But at the same time, there are people crossing that border into the United States illegally. We need better border enforcement, smarter border enforcement, using the best technology available today. Some of the suggestions we have heard I think are perhaps in answer to a problem of 100 years ago, but building a wall around the United States is hardly going to stop the immigration problem.

Over half the people currently in the United States undocumented did not enter illegally across the border. They came here legally, and because their visas expired or there were other circumstances or changes in the paperwork that they filed with our Government, they are not presently documented or in legal status. So this concept of building a fence or building a wall seems to me to be nothing more than a symbol—perhaps an unfortunate symbol—for a country as great as America.

Let me say a word or two about the bill that is going to be debated on the Senate floor for several days, perhaps through next week. It is a bill which addresses our immigration system in America. Most everyone agrees: This system needs to be changed. It is not fair. It is not a system that we are proud of because it doesn't deal with the serious issue of how many people are in the United States not in legal status—undocumented people.

One of the comments made several times during the course of the debate by my colleague from Alabama was that the bill coming out of the Senate Judiciary Committee creates amnesty. What is amnesty? Very simply, if you have been charged and found guilty of a crime, an amnesty says: We forgive you. We are not going to hold you responsible for your crime. There are things that you can do to pay your price to society for the crime you have committed. If you pay that price, people say: Well, that isn't amnesty. You have extracted some cost for the crime that has been committed.

Let me remind my colleague from Alabama what this bill does that comes to the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from today's New York Times of March 29, 2006, entitled, "It Isn't Amnesty."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### IT ISN'T AMNESTY

Here's one way to kill a cow: take it into the woods in hunting season, paint the word "deer" on it and stand back.

Something like that is happening in the immigration debate in Washington. Attackers of a smart, tough Senate bill have smeared it with the most mealy-mouthed word in the immigration glossary—amnesty—in hopes of rendering it politically toxic. They claim that the bill would bestow an official federal blessing of forgiveness on an estimated 12 million people who are living here illegally, rewarding their brazen crimes and encouraging more of the same.